

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed August 28, 2006. Claims 1, 2, 4-11 and 13 remain pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, 10, 11 and 13 stand rejected. Claims 4-8 were indicated to contain allowable subject matter and claim 9 was allowed. Claims 1, 2 and 4-10 have been amended herein. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks.

Objections to the Claims

Claims 2 and 4-8 were objected to for various informalities related to the claim language. These claims have been amended herein as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objections to claims 2 and 4-8 be withdrawn.

Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 2, 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,957,783 to Gabryszewski. Claims 1 and 10 are the only independent claims of this rejected group. While Applicants believe that claims 1 and 10 are not taught or suggested by Gabryszewski '783, for the reasons set forth below, claims 1 and 10 have been amended herein to more sharply define these claims. Specifically, claim 1 is directed to an apparatus for dispensing liquid material and has been amended herein to recite "a controller coupled with said air valve and operable to actuate said air valve in a manner that pulses the pressurized air discharging from said air outlet as the liquid material is discharged to move the liquid material discharging from said liquid discharge outlet in a desired pattern as an attenuated continuous stream." Claim 10 is directed to a method of dispensing liquid material, and has been

amended to recite "pulsing the pressurized air while dispensing the liquid material to cause the liquid material to move in a desired pattern as an attenuated continuous stream." Support for these amendments can be found in the Application, for example, at paragraph 0007 and with reference to FIGS. 1 and 2. Accordingly, no new matter has been added by these amendments.

The apparatus of claim 1 and the method of claim 10, therefore, both utilize pressurized air to move liquid material in a desired pattern as an attenuated continuous stream. As set forth in the Specification, the pattern may be, for example, an oscillating pattern or a swirl pattern. (See Application at paragraph 0023 and FIG. 2.) In contrast, Gabryszewski '783 is directed to a device wherein "atomizing air passes through each of the jet bores 118 and impacts the outside of adhesive stream 119 to form droplets 120 for deposition onto a substrate 121" (emphasis added). (See Gabryszewski '783 at col. 8, lines 63-66.) The intent of Gabryszewski '783 is to minimize the presence of "angel hair" (stringy or strand-like fibers of adhesive) between the droplets. (See Gabryszewski '783 at col. 2, lines 15-21; col. 3, lines 3-7; and col. 3, lines 30-40.) Gabryszewski '783, therefore, does not teach or suggest moving liquid material in a desired pattern as an attenuated continuous stream, as set forth in claims 1 and 10, but rather teaches that "these pulsed or intermittent jets of atomizing air initially impact the outside or exterior surface of the continuous stream of thermoplastic adhesive ejected from the nozzle and shear or break up such stream into droplets which are deposited onto a substrate." (Gabryszewski '783 at col. 3, lines 25-29.) Using atomizing air to form droplets of liquid is not the same as moving a liquid material "in a desired pattern as an attenuated continuous stream." For at least these reasons,

Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 1 and 10 over Gabryszevski '783 be withdrawn.

Claim 2 depends from independent claim 1, and claim 11 depends from independent claim 10. Accordingly, claims 2 and 11 are each in condition for allowance for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 10. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejections of claims 2 and 11 over Gabryszevski '783 be withdrawn.

Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gabryszevski '783. Claim 13 depends from independent claim 10. Applicants therefore assert that claim 13 is in condition for allowance for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 10. Specifically, Gabryszevski '783 fails to teach or suggest "pulsing the pressurized air while dispensing the liquid material to cause the liquid material to move in a desired pattern as an attenuated continuous stream." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 13 over Gabryszevski '783 be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 9 is allowed and claims 4-8 were objected to for depending from rejected base claims, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Formalistic amendments have been made to claim 9, however, claim 9 should remain allowable. Applicants believe that rewriting claims 4-8 in independent form is unnecessary in view of the foregoing remarks.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments to the claims and the remarks set forth herein, Applicants believe this case is in condition for allowance and respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes any issue requires further discussion, the Examiner is respectfully asked to telephone the undersigned attorney so that the matter may be promptly resolved. The Examiner's prompt attention to this matter is appreciated.

Applicants do not believe that any fee is due in connection with this submission. However, if any fees are necessary to complete this communication, the Commissioner may consider this to be a request for such and charge any necessary fees to Deposit Account No. 23-3000.

Respectfully submitted,

WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, L.L.P.

/Kevin G. Rooney/
Kevin G. Rooney, Reg. No. 36,330

2700 Carew Tower
441 Vine Street
Cincinnati, OH 45202
(513) 241-2324 (voice)
(513) 241-6234 (facsimile)